UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,832	10/17/2003	Chad Allan McGregor	53782O-008	2393

24187 7590 04/02/2008

MILLER NASH LLP
601 UNION STREET
SUITE4400
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2352

EXAMINER	
AILES, BENJAMIN A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/688,832	MCGREGOR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BENJAMIN A. AILES	2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 December 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4,5,7,10-12,15,17,20-22,26-28 and 31-49* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4,5,7,10-12,15,17,20-22,26-28 and 31-49* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 13 September 2007 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendment to claim 1 has been entered into the record and overcomes the prior rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The rejection has therefore been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 10-12, 15, 17, 20-22, 26-28, 31-34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Homsi (US 7,065,493 B1).

5. Regarding claim 1, Homsi teaches a method for defining a workflow process, said method comprising the steps of: (a) collecting a plurality of data (col. 4, ll. 65-66); (b) defining at least one data record based on said plurality of data using a user interface data selection technique (col. 5, ll. 3-5); (c) allocating said at least one defined data record to at least one data file (col. 4, ll. 58-65); (d) organizing said at least one data file into at least one form (col. 4, ll. 58-66); and (e) defining properties of at least one action object, at least on property including at least one form related function for processing said at least one form (col. 16, lines 14-18).

6. Regarding claim 2, Homsi teaches the method further comprising saving at least one data record at a master center (Homsi, col. 6, ll. 2-6).

7. Regarding claim 4, Homsi teaches the method wherein said step of defining at least one data record based on said plurality of data is performed by an end user using user interface data selection techniques that do not require programming experience (Homsi, col. 6, ll. 7-11).

8. Regarding claim 5, Homsi teaches the method further comprising the step of saving said at least one data file at a master center (Homsi, col. 6, ll. 2-6).

9. Regarding claim 7, Homsi teaches the method further comprising the step of saving said at least one form at a master center (Homsi, col. 6, ll. 2-6).

10. Regarding claim 10, Homsi teaches the method further comprising the step of formatting said at least one form into a format defined by a group consisting of: (a) an end user; and (b) a system analyst (col. 6, ll. 4-6).

11. Regarding claim 11, Homsi teaches the method further comprising the step of

saving said at least one formatted form on said master center (Homsi, col. 6, ll. 2-6).

12. Regarding claim 12, Homsi teaches the method further comprising the step of developing a user interface to be used in connection with said workflow process (col. 4, ll. 48-57).

13. Regarding claims 15, Homsi teaches a method for creating a workflow process, said method comprising the steps of: (a) accessing a business logic editor located on a master center (col. 6, ll. 7-11); (b) presenting at least two action object icons on a user interface (Fig. 3, item 314, col. 6, ll. 35-37); (c) accessing a canvas screen (Fig. 3 item 304, col. 6, ll. 35-37); (d) selecting a first of said at least two action object icons (Fig. 3 and col. 6, ll. 36-39); (e) moving said first of at least two action object icons to said canvas screen (fig. 3 and col. 6, ll. 46-48); (f) defining properties for said first of at least two action object icons (col. 6, ll. 40-44); (g) moving a second of said at least two action object icons to said canvas screen (fig. 3 and col. 6, ll. 46-48); (h) defining properties for said second of at least two action object icons (col. 6, ll. 40-44); (i) linking said at least two action object icons to create a workflow process (fig. 3 and col. 6, ll. 59-62); and (j) defining form processing actions by setting action object icon properties for said at least two action object icons (col. 6, ll. 40-44), at least one form related function for processing at least one form consisting of previously defined data files that have been formatted (col. 16, lines 14-18).

14. Regarding claim 17, Homsi teaches the method further comprising the step of accessing said master center using a web based user interface (col. 4, ll. 48-57 and col. 17, ll. 44-47).

15. Regarding claim 20, Homsi discloses a method for executing a workflow process, said method comprising:

(a) inputting a request to access a workflow process to a master center (col. 16, lines 2-8; workflow requests are submitted to a router);

(b) accessing said requested workflow process via a web service, said requested workflow process containing at least two action object icons (fig. 3 and col. 16, ll. 14-18 and col. 17, ll. 44-48);

(c) executing a first action object icon of said workflow process (col. 16, ll. 25-28);

(d) saving said executed first action object icon on said master center (col. 6, ll. 2-6);

(e) determining a second action object icon of said workflow process (col. 16, ll. 14-18);

(f) executing a second action object icon of said workflow process (col. 16, ll. 25-28);

(g) saving said executed second action object icon on said master center (col. 6, ll. 2-6); and

(h) continuing to execute said action object icons of said workflow process until said workflow process is complete (col. 16, ll. 43-48).

16. Regarding claim 21, Homsi discloses the method of executing at least two action object icons of said workflow process further including accessing said at least two action object icons to review at least one form (col. 16, lines 14-18).

17. Regarding claim 22, Homsi discloses the method further comprising the step of

inputting data on said at least one form (col. 16, lines 50-55).

18. Regarding claim 26, Homsi teaches a method for defining a workflow process, said method comprising the steps of: (a) collecting a plurality of data (col. 4, ll. 65-66); (b) defining at least one data record based on said plurality of data (col. 5, ll. 3-5); (c) allocating said at least one defined data record to at least one data file (col. 4, ll. 58-65); (d) organizing said at least one data file into at least one form (col. 4, ll. 58-66); and means for defining properties of at least one action object, at least one property including at least one form related function for processing said at least one form col. 16, lines 14-18).

19. Regarding claim 27, Homsi teaches a method for creating a workflow process, said method comprising the steps of: (a) accessing a business logic editor located on a master center (col. 6, ll. 7-11); (b) presenting at least two action object icons on a user interface (Fig. 3, item 314, col. 6, ll. 35-37); (c) accessing a canvas screen (Fig. 3 item 304, col. 6, ll. 35-37); (d) selecting a first of said at least two action object icons (Fig. 3 and col. 6, ll. 36-39); (e) moving said first of at least two action object icons to said canvas screen (fig. 3 and col. 6, ll. 46-48); (f) defining properties for said first of at least two action object icons (col. 6, ll. 40-44); (g) moving a second of said at least two action object icons to said canvas screen (fig. 3 and col. 6, ll. 46-48); (h) defining properties for said second of at least two action object icons (col. 6, ll. 40-44); (i) linking said at least two action object icons to create a workflow process (fig. 3 and col. 6, ll. 59-62); and (j) defining form processing actions by setting action object icon properties for said at least two action object icons (col. 6, ll. 40-44).

20. Regarding claim 28, Homsi discloses a system for executing a workflow process, said method comprising:

(a) inputting a request to access a workflow process to a master center (col. 16, lines 2-8; workflow requests are submitted to a router);

(b) accessing said requested workflow process via a web service, said requested workflow process containing at least two action object icons (fig. 3 and col. 16, ll. 14-18 and col. 17, ll. 44-48);

(c) executing a first action object icon of said workflow process (col. 16, ll. 25-28);

(d) saving said executed first action object icon on said master center (col. 6, ll. 2-6);

(e) determining a second action object icon of said workflow process (col. 16, ll. 14-18);

(f) executing a second action object icon of said workflow process (col. 16, ll. 25-28);

(g) saving said executed second action object icon on said master center (col. 6, ll. 2-6); and

(h) continuing to execute said action object icons of said workflow process until said workflow process is complete (col. 16, ll. 43-48).

21. Regarding claims 31, Homsi teaches a method for creating a workflow process, said method comprising the steps of: (a) accessing a business logic editor located on a master center (col. 6, ll. 7-11); (b) presenting at least two action object icons on a user interface (Fig. 3, item 314, col. 6, ll. 35-37); (c) accessing a canvas screen (Fig. 3 item

304, col. 6, ll. 35-37); (d) selecting a first of said at least two action object icons (Fig. 3 and col. 6, ll. 36-39); (e) moving said first of at least two action object icons to said canvas screen (fig. 3 and col. 6, ll. 46-48); (f) defining properties for said first of at least two action object icons (col. 6, ll. 40-44); (g) moving a second of said at least two action object icons to said canvas screen (fig. 3 and col. 6, ll. 46-48); (h) defining properties for said second of at least two action object icons (col. 6, ll. 40-44); (i) linking said at least two action object icons to create a workflow process (fig. 3 and col. 6, ll. 59-62); and (j) defining form processing actions by setting action object icon properties for said at least two action object icons (col. 6, ll. 40-44), at least one form related function for processing at least one form consisting of previously defined data files that have been formatted (col. 16, lines 14-18).

22. Regarding claim 32, Homsi teaches a method for creating a workflow process, said method comprising the steps of: (a) accessing a business logic editor located on a master center (col. 6, ll. 7-11); (b) presenting at least two action object icons on a user interface (Fig. 3, item 314, col. 6, ll. 35-37); (c) accessing a canvas screen (Fig. 3 item 304, col. 6, ll. 35-37); (d) selecting a first of said at least two action object icons (Fig. 3 and col. 6, ll. 36-39); (e) moving said first of at least two action object icons to said canvas screen (fig. 3 and col. 6, ll. 46-48); (f) defining properties for said first of at least two action object icons (col. 6, ll. 40-44); (g) moving a second of said at least two action object icons to said canvas screen (fig. 3 and col. 6, ll. 46-48); (h) defining properties for said second of at least two action object icons (col. 6, ll. 40-44); (i) linking said at least two action object icons to create a workflow process (fig. 3 and col. 6, ll. 59-62); and (j)

defining form processing actions by setting action object icon properties for said at least two action object icons (col. 6, ll. 40-44).

23. Regarding claim 33, Homsi teaches the system wherein said workflow process may be executed via web services (col. 16, ll. 14-18 and col. 17, ll. 44-48).

24. Regarding claim 34, Homsi discloses the method, said step of defining properties of at least one action object further comprising defining at least one property to include at least one form related function for processing said at least one form selected from the group consisting of: (a) saving data entered into said at least one form in a database server, a forms server, or a user interface server (Homsi, col. 6, ll. 2-6); (b) checking for combinations of data on said at least one form; (c) initiating emails to an end user based on data entered into said at least one form; (d) generating correspondence to an end user based on data entered into said at least one form; and (e) generating audit information based on said at least one form.

25. Regarding claim 36, Homsi discloses the method, said step of defining properties of at least one action object further comprising defining at least one property to include at least one form related function for processing said at least one form selected from the group consisting of: (a) saving data entered into said at least one form in a database server, a forms server, or a user interface server (Homsi, col. 6, ll. 2-6); (b) checking for combinations of data on said at least one form; (c) initiating emails to an end user based on data entered into said at least one form; (d) generating correspondence to an end user based on data entered into said at least one form; and (e) generating audit information based on said at least one form.

26. Regarding claim 38, Homsi discloses the method, said step of defining properties of at least one action object further comprising defining at least one property to include at least one form related function for processing said at least one form selected from the group consisting of: (a) saving data entered into said at least one form in a database server, a forms server, or a user interface server (Homsi, col. 6, ll. 2-6); (b) checking for combinations of data on said at least one form; (c) initiating emails to an end user based on data entered into said at least one form; (d) generating correspondence to an end user based on data entered into said at least one form; and (e) generating audit information based on said at least one form.

27. Regarding claim 40, Homsi discloses the method, said step of defining properties of at least one action object further comprising defining at least one property to include at least one form related function for processing said at least one form selected from the group consisting of: (a) saving data entered into said at least one form in a database server, a forms server, or a user interface server (Homsi, col. 6, ll. 2-6); (b) checking for combinations of data on said at least one form; (c) initiating emails to an end user based on data entered into said at least one form; (d) generating correspondence to an end user based on data entered into said at least one form; and (e) generating audit information based on said at least one form.

28. Regarding claim 42, Homsi discloses the method, said step of defining properties of at least one action object further comprising defining at least one property to include at least one form related function for processing said at least one form selected from the group consisting of: (a) saving data entered into said at least one form in a database

server, a forms server, or a user interface server (Homsi, col. 6, ll. 2-6); (b) checking for combinations of data on said at least one form; (c) initiating emails to an end user based on data entered into said at least one form; (d) generating correspondence to an end user based on data entered into said at least one form; and (e) generating audit information based on said at least one form.

29. Regarding claim 44, Homsi discloses the method, said step of defining properties of at least one action object further comprising defining at least one property to include at least one form related function for processing said at least one form selected from the group consisting of: (a) saving data entered into said at least one form in a database server, a forms server, or a user interface server (Homsi, col. 6, ll. 2-6); (b) checking for combinations of data on said at least one form; (c) initiating emails to an end user based on data entered into said at least one form; (d) generating correspondence to an end user based on data entered into said at least one form; and (e) generating audit information based on said at least one form.

30. Regarding claim 46, Homsi discloses the method, said step of defining properties of at least one action object further comprising defining at least one property to include at least one form related function for processing said at least one form selected from the group consisting of: (a) saving data entered into said at least one form in a database server, a forms server, or a user interface server (Homsi, col. 6, ll. 2-6); (b) checking for combinations of data on said at least one form; (c) initiating emails to an end user based on data entered into said at least one form; (d) generating correspondence to an end user based on data entered into said at least one form; and (e) generating audit

information based on said at least one form.

31. Regarding claim 48, Homsi discloses the method, said step of defining properties of at least one action object further comprising defining at least one property to include at least one form related function for processing said at least one form selected from the group consisting of: (a) saving data entered into said at least one form in a database server, a forms server, or a user interface server (Homsi, col. 6, ll. 2-6); (b) checking for combinations of data on said at least one form; (c) initiating emails to an end user based on data entered into said at least one form; (d) generating correspondence to an end user based on data entered into said at least one form; and (e) generating audit information based on said at least one form.

32. Claims 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45, 47 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homsi (US 7,065,493 B1) in view of Horan et al. (U 2003/0225663 A1), hereinafter referred to as Horan.

33. Regarding claim 35, Homsi teaches the utilization of a user interface on a user machine (col. 6, ll. 7-11) wherein the user machine is in communication with a centralized storage database server (col. 6, ll. 2-6) but does not explicitly recite that the user machine uses a thin client application. The user machine using a thin client application is deemed an obvious variation in the art as evidenced by Horan. Horan is recognized as being within the same field of endeavor as Homsi. Horan teaches wherein a thin client browser based interface (p. 10, para. 0111) is implemented to manage the objects of a workflow. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious at the time of the applicants' invention to implement as an obvious

variation the user machine to be a thin client. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to utilize a thin client as taught by Horan wherein it is known to be beneficial in the art to utilize a thin client because thin-client technology does not require the installation of product updates and service releases on a user's desktop (p. 5, para. 0063).

34. Regarding claim 37, Homsi teaches the utilization of a user interface on a user machine (col. 6, ll. 7-11) wherein the user machine is in communication with a centralized storage database server (col. 6, ll. 2-6) but does not explicitly recite that the user machine uses a thin client application. The user machine using a thin client application is deemed an obvious variation in the art as evidenced by Horan. Horan is recognized as being within the same field of endeavor as Homsi. Horan teaches wherein a thin client browser based interface (p. 10, para. 0111) is implemented to manage the objects of a workflow. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious at the time of the applicants' invention to implement as an obvious variation the user machine to be a thin client. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to utilize a thin client as taught by Horan wherein it is known to be beneficial in the art to utilize a thin client because thin-client technology does not require the installation of product updates and service releases on a user's desktop (p. 5, para. 0063).

35. Regarding claim 39, Homsi teaches the utilization of a user interface on a user machine (col. 6, ll. 7-11) wherein the user machine is in communication with a centralized storage database server (col. 6, ll. 2-6) but does not explicitly recite that the

user machine uses a thin client application. The user machine using a thin client application is deemed an obvious variation in the art as evidenced by Horan. Horan is recognized as being within the same field of endeavor as Homsi. Horan teaches wherein a thin client browser based interface (p. 10, para. 0111) is implemented to manage the objects of a workflow. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious at the time of the applicants' invention to implement as an obvious variation the user machine to be a thin client. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to utilize a thin client as taught by Horan wherein it is known to be beneficial in the art to utilize a thin client because thin-client technology does not require the installation of product updates and service releases on a user's desktop (p. 5, para. 0063).

36. Regarding claim 41, Homsi teaches the utilization of a user interface on a user machine (col. 6, ll. 7-11) wherein the user machine is in communication with a centralized storage database server (col. 6, ll. 2-6) but does not explicitly recite that the user machine uses a thin client application. The user machine using a thin client application is deemed an obvious variation in the art as evidenced by Horan. Horan is recognized as being within the same field of endeavor as Homsi. Horan teaches wherein a thin client browser based interface (p. 10, para. 0111) is implemented to manage the objects of a workflow. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious at the time of the applicants' invention to implement as an obvious variation the user machine to be a thin client. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to utilize a thin client as taught by Horan wherein it is known to be

beneficial in the art to utilize a thin client because thin-client technology does not require the installation of product updates and service releases on a user's desktop (p. 5, para. 0063).

37. Regarding claim 43, Homsi teaches the utilization of a user interface on a user machine (col. 6, ll. 7-11) wherein the user machine is in communication with a centralized storage database server (col. 6, ll. 2-6) but does not explicitly recite that the user machine uses a thin client application. The user machine using a thin client application is deemed an obvious variation in the art as evidenced by Horan. Horan is recognized as being within the same field of endeavor as Homsi. Horan teaches wherein a thin client browser based interface (p. 10, para. 0111) is implemented to manage the objects of a workflow. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious at the time of the applicants' invention to implement as an obvious variation the user machine to be a thin client. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to utilize a thin client as taught by Horan wherein it is known to be beneficial in the art to utilize a thin client because thin-client technology does not require the installation of product updates and service releases on a user's desktop (p. 5, para. 0063).

38. Regarding claim 45, Homsi teaches the utilization of a user interface on a user machine (col. 6, ll. 7-11) wherein the user machine is in communication with a centralized storage database server (col. 6, ll. 2-6) but does not explicitly recite that the user machine uses a thin client application. The user machine using a thin client application is deemed an obvious variation in the art as evidenced by Horan. Horan is

recognized as being within the same field of endeavor as Homsi. Horan teaches wherein a thin client browser based interface (p. 10, para. 0111) is implemented to manage the objects of a workflow. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious at the time of the applicants' invention to implement as an obvious variation the user machine to be a thin client. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to utilize a thin client as taught by Horan wherein it is known to be beneficial in the art to utilize a thin client because thin-client technology does not require the installation of product updates and service releases on a user's desktop (p. 5, para. 0063).

39. Regarding claim 47, Homsi teaches the utilization of a user interface on a user machine (col. 6, ll. 7-11) wherein the user machine is in communication with a centralized storage database server (col. 6, ll. 2-6) but does not explicitly recite that the user machine uses a thin client application. The user machine using a thin client application is deemed an obvious variation in the art as evidenced by Horan. Horan is recognized as being within the same field of endeavor as Homsi. Horan teaches wherein a thin client browser based interface (p. 10, para. 0111) is implemented to manage the objects of a workflow. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious at the time of the applicants' invention to implement as an obvious variation the user machine to be a thin client. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to utilize a thin client as taught by Horan wherein it is known to be beneficial in the art to utilize a thin client because thin-client technology does not require the installation of product updates and service releases on a user's desktop (p. 5, para.

0063).

40. Regarding claim 49, Homsi teaches the utilization of a user interface on a user machine (col. 6, ll. 7-11) wherein the user machine is in communication with a centralized storage database server (col. 6, ll. 2-6) but does not explicitly recite that the user machine uses a thin client application. The user machine using a thin client application is deemed an obvious variation in the art as evidenced by Horan. Horan is recognized as being within the same field of endeavor as Homsi. Horan teaches wherein a thin client browser based interface (p. 10, para. 0111) is implemented to manage the objects of a workflow. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious at the time of the applicants' invention to implement as an obvious variation the user machine to be a thin client. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to utilize a thin client as taught by Horan wherein it is known to be beneficial in the art to utilize a thin client because thin-client technology does not require the installation of product updates and service releases on a user's desktop (p. 5, para. 0063).

Response to Arguments

41. Applicant's arguments filed 12 December 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues with respect to the filed claims (see p. 16 of Remarks) that the claimed "forms" as described by the applicant's specification are not traditional forms as known in the art and are instead being defined as a collection of data or data files and further that the claimed "action objects" represent how the form is treated in a workflow process. Applicant argues further that Homsi's reference does in

fact teach the terms "form" and "document" but contends that Homsi's "form" and "document" can not be equated to the applicants' claimed "form." The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner maintains that the rejection is proper because Homsi teaches on the broadly claimed "form" in the sense as a collection of data used to define workflow logic as defined by the applicant's written disclosure in column 15, line 2 – column 16, line 13 wherein Homsi teaches the utilization of a Flowbuilder the provides the tools to administer workflow applications in an organization. The administration tasks include exception handling, reporting and analysis. The Flowbuilder further extends administration options allowing workflow administrators the ability to set frequency and priority of workflow processing. Therefore, Homsi is found to teach on the applicant's claimed "form" aspect as being a collection of data that is used to define workflow logic. Applicant argues with respect to the "action object" that the Homsi reference does not associate a form to an action object. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Homsi teaches the interaction wherein in column 6, lines 45-52 the creation of workflow cycles wherein the editing of workflows can be performed and further the dragging and dropping of certain workflow cycles can be performed to further define a workflow. The interaction with a form, or collection of data to define the workflow logic is taught in col. 6, lines 53-59 wherein workflow cycles are defined to be structured collaborations that include events and conditions. These events and conditions are found to be within the scope of the claimed "action objects" and "forms." The remaining arguments for the remaining claims set forth by the applicant are essentially the same as set forth and responded to above and therefore the claims are not found to be

patentable for the reasons as set forth above. The examiner would also note that the Applicants have not pointed to an actual definition of the word "form" in their specification. Since a definition of the term is absent from the specification, there is no reason to read language from the specification into the claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin A. Ailes whose telephone number is (571)272-3899. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4, IFP Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B. A. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 2142

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2142